

UNITED WISDOM

Leadership: Power as a Duty to Sustain the Conditions

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A36 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Leadership: Power as a Duty to Sustain the Conditions

Epigraph

> *for the interest of his subject*

Plato, Republic, I, 342e. A short fragment of Socrates' argument in Benjamin Jowett's translation. It belongs to a contested dialogue, not a description of infallible leaders.

What this article is about

A leader is often noticed at the moment of decision: choosing a direction, signing an agreement, or ending a dispute. Yet power also operates in less visible places. Whoever sets a deadline, permits a task to change, provides access to information, and determines the cost of dissent changes the conditions of other people's work. Even quiet silence can leave people responsible for a task without the means to carry it out.

Leadership can therefore be considered a duty to sustain those conditions: making the purpose intelligible, matching demands to capacities, keeping difficulties reportable, and answering honestly for one's own interventions. This promises neither comfort nor constant agreement nor a guaranteed result. Sometimes it requires an unwelcome decision, withdrawing an attractive promise, or acknowledging the limits of authority.

This article considers hypothetical joint projects with discussable powers. It distinguishes care from control, autonomy from abandonment, and personal example from requiring others to imitate the manager's personality. Ancient texts help frame the purpose of power; the practical choices remain editorial reasoning rather than a scientific model of managing people.

I. Authority Takes Its Meaning from What It Serves

In Book I of the Republic, Socrates connects the art of ruling with the good of the governed, while Thrasymachus defends the advantage of the stronger. An analogy with perfect expertise does not establish real rulers' infallibility. The relevant question concerns authority's purpose: whom should it benefit? Applying that question to a joint project requires further reasoning. Participants are neither a flock nor passive material; they have purposes, a voice, and a capacity to judge the conditions of participation.

Suppose a coordinator receives the power to assign work in a small team. That power alone does not explain why others should accept the decisions. An explanation comes through the

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

common task: assignments should account for dependencies, intelligible criteria, and available means. If authority mainly protects the coordinator’s convenience, the role’s purpose changes. A title, signature, and hierarchy can remain formally intact while the substantive basis for a demand is lost. Ask both who decides and what joint difficulty this particular authority enables people to resolve.

Serving the task does not mean fulfilling every participant’s wish. Two justified interests can conflict, and resources can be insufficient. The leader must then name the reason for choosing and the limits being accepted. A demand becomes assessable: people can see what was sacrificed and why. Invoking a leader’s special, undiscussable intuition is a poor substitute for explanation. Particular experience can be a reason; it does not remove the need to connect a decision with its purpose, cost, and the rights of those affected.

II. Name the Conditions Before Judging the Person

Conditions include more than equipment or a budget. They include the task’s boundaries, a way to obtain clarification, the permitted degree of autonomy, and how requirements may change. Someone may agree to produce a draft without agreeing to unlimited revisions after every new idea. Calling that distinction a lack of loyalty turns the original assignment into another obligation. Sustaining conditions means keeping the agreement distinguishable: what was accepted, what arrived later, and where renewed agreement is needed. Otherwise even conscientious performance cannot be assessed confidently.

In a hypothetical project, several specialists share responsibility for a launch. One lacks input data, another does not know who approves a disputed choice, and a third is waiting for access to a tool. Accusing them of insufficient initiative can conceal three different managerial duties. Establish which gap obstructs the work and who can close it. The worker also has a responsibility to report an obstacle promptly within their capacities. Reporting it, however, does not grant authority available only to the leader or automatically transfer someone else’s delay to the worker.

Examining conditions must not become a way never to discuss performance. The means may be available and the task clear, yet agreed work remains undone. Discuss specific actions and reasons rather than pass judgment on the whole person. The sequence matters: failure to meet a demand cannot be discussed fairly while the demand itself changes during the explanation. A preserved task description, a known deadline, and a named recipient make the discussion more definite. They do not guarantee agreement, but allow a dispute about the actual obligation rather than its retrospective reconstruction.

III. Autonomy Needs Support and a Boundary

Power can harm through excessive interference or insufficient participation. Checking every step removes another person's opportunity to answer for a chosen method. Disappearing at the first difficulty leaves autonomy without necessary support. There is no single correct frequency of contact between these extremes. Agree where the worker decides independently, which change requires approval, and what signal brings the task back for discussion. That boundary describes actual powers rather than leaving trust as an attractive word spoken at the project's beginning.

Imagine entrusting negotiations to an experienced colleague. They may discuss dates but may neither increase the price nor promise an unverified result. If the other party requests a change, the colleague needs an intelligible way to obtain the leader's decision. Being told to work it out without permission to change the conditions does not expand autonomy; it creates a contradictory assignment. Grant limited authority or take responsibility for approving the disputed part. The task determines the choice. Full responsibility for an agreement cannot fairly be demanded while someone else retains all its substantial decisions.

Support also needs an agreement. Some questions can wait for the next meeting; others call for an immediate stop. Where risk concerns safety or other people's rights, the leader's convenience is insufficient grounds for continuing uncertain work. Every minor difficulty need not become an emergency, either. Distinguish them by possible consequences and the limits of authority, not by how confidently the manager speaks. Useful support lets someone act within an agreed area and return a question to whoever has the power to change that area itself.

IV. Trust Cannot Be Demanded in Place of Means

Analects XII.7 treats people's confidence as a necessary support of government; XIII.6 connects government with the ruler's own conduct. These passages concern a historical political and moral hierarchy, not proof that a good example automatically works. We do not transfer the advice to dispense with food into workplace resource allocation. The present question is different: which observable actions can support trust in someone who changes others' conditions? A demand for personal belief especially needs examination when another person's obligation depends on it.

After revising a deadline twice, a leader's sincere request for trust does not adequately explain the next date. Show what changed: reduced scope, an available worker, a removed dependency, or a revised external promise. Circumstances may still be unclear. Mark the date as provisional and name the next check rather than demanding final agreement on the strength of a confident tone. Trust is supported by distinguishing what is known from what is assumed.

Respect for a leader does not necessarily provide sufficient grounds to accept a new risk for another participant or one’s family.

Doubt need not always be answered by disclosing every detail. Some private information and decisions are not the leader’s to share. State that limit, however, rather than presenting missing information as proven safety. A smaller commitment, an independent check, or a different role may be needed. Trust is no universal replacement for access to facts. It supports cooperation under reasonable incomplete knowledge; it does not turn a request into consent or remove the duty to disclose a known, substantial uncertainty before people bear its cost.

V. Personal Example Is Tested by Consistent Rules

Personal example is sometimes treated as a contest in endurance: the manager works at night, so others must not refuse. That transfer ignores different obligations and lives. Example is more useful when a leader applies the announced rule to themselves. If delays must be reported early, the leader’s delays should also be visible. If changing scope warrants revising a deadline, that also applies when the leader expands a task. Otherwise the example expresses only the stronger person’s ability to impose their rhythm rather than a clear arrangement of shared responsibility.

A consistent rule does not mean identical powers or consequences. A leader may access information unavailable to others and make the final choice. Explain that difference by the role rather than personal superiority. For example, additional scrutiny of the leader’s decision may be justified by its wider impact. It should not disappear because an office supposedly deserves special trust. The more people depend on one choice, the more important it is that its reasons can be examined and mistakes corrected within accessible information. Public demands placed on others do not replace scrutiny of one’s own decision.

Demonstrative openness also has a limit. A leader need not turn every episode of fatigue, family difficulty, or private mistake into a lesson for everyone. Example concerns what people need to understand the joint task. A changed availability and a substitute can be announced without the personal reason. An incorrect work assessment can be corrected without describing every inner feeling. This respects both sides’ boundaries: people receive information affecting their work, while personal confession is neither made compulsory for trust nor expected in return from the team.

VI. An Objection Needs a Usable Route

A right to object becomes empty if someone does not know whom to tell about a contradiction or what happens next. An invitation to speak openly can coexist with a habit of considering only convenient suggestions. Sustaining conditions requires a route for substantial disagreement: a recipient, a subject for consideration, and a way to communicate the outcome. This does not promise to satisfy every objection. It allows a reason to become visible before a choice or supports timely reconsideration afterward. Criticism of a plan, a report of harm, and a request to change a personal commitment may need different responses.

Suppose a participant believes the chosen sequence leaves an important part unchecked. The leader may disagree, but should establish which part, which anticipated consequence, and what supports that concern. Saying that the decision is already made may end repetition; it does not answer substantial new information. If it was considered earlier, explain how. If it is new, the previous meeting’s completion does not make it insignificant. A final decision and final knowledge are different things. Authority to make the first does not create the second.

A usable route must not require someone first to endure humiliation or persuade everyone present. Some reports need a separate conversation, especially when they involve private information or unequal power. Confidentiality, however, does not justify indefinitely hiding a confirmed problem from people whose actions it affects. Respond proportionately: examine the grounds, protect unnecessary personal detail, and communicate the necessary change to those affected. If the complaint concerns the leader, their promise of objectivity may be insufficient. Seek an available independent route rather than treating their impartiality as an established fact.

VII. Care Does Not Confer Ownership of a Person

Care can mean accessible learning, a clear route to help, and protection from a meaningless demand. It loses its basis when it becomes a right to decide everything in another person’s life. An opportunity does not create an indefinite debt of obedience. Even sincere help does not imply agreement to a new assignment, personal closeness, or permanent availability. In a hypothetical project, a participant can be grateful while refusing another role. The leader may discuss the refusal’s consequences for the work, but should not replace a work agreement with a demand to prove personal gratitude.

Support and dependence are especially difficult to separate when a leader knows about a participant’s private difficulty. Flexibility can help, but its conditions should remain intelligible. If extra work is silently expected in return, the person cannot know what they owe. Agree separately on a changed scope or date, and do not turn private knowledge into pressure. Accepting help is not permission to tell everyone its reason. The participant retains a say in

disclosing personal information, unless a specific other obligation requires separate consideration.

Care also has material limits. A leader cannot always preserve every role or provide every desirable resource. An honest refusal can be more responsible than a promise others will eventually pay for. But call it a refusal rather than a test of the recipient's maturity. Explain the accessible grounds, offer an actually available alternative, and do not promise results from unknown people. When cooperation ends, attend to completed work, remaining obligations, and the person's right to leave. Caring about the ending does not require controlling their subsequent life or securing their affection for the leader.

VIII. Discretion Helps While Responsibility Remains Traceable

In chapter 17 of the Tao Teh King, James Legge presents completed work after which people describe themselves as acting on their own. This is an ancient image of government in relation to the Tao, not advice to conceal decisions or authorship. It raises a question: must every successful task confirm the leader's indispensability? A practical answer needs another basis—traceable authority and responsibility. People can act without constant intervention while still needing to know who changes conditions and where an unresolved question may be returned.

Discreet leadership can mean dependencies were resolved in advance, information is accessible, and an ordinary clarification does not become a struggle for attention. From outside, this can resemble inactivity. Difficulty reveals the difference: is there an agreed route to a decision, who addresses missing means, and who explains a changed common promise? The leader need not attend every meeting. A real substitute is needed where the task would stop without their authority. Listing a substitute's name does not help if they never agreed, lack decision rights, or are unavailable when needed.

Not all indispensability comes from vanity. A small project may genuinely depend on one person's rare skill or personal commitment. Name that dependence and its limit rather than pretending the team is already autonomous. Some knowledge can gradually be transferred, risk reduced, or a pause agreed. Learning must not involve a dangerous trial on unsuspecting recipients. The ability to act without the leader rests on assessed readiness and agreed conditions. An attractive story about trust does not create it, and genuine remaining involvement need not be concealed.

IX. The Cost of a Decision Must Stay in the Explanation

Sustaining conditions sometimes requires limiting a valued goal. If the deadline remains while available means shrink, someone must name what can no longer be promised. A leader may face unwelcome alternatives without being entitled to present the absence of a good option as the absence of choice altogether. Distinguish unavoidable external loss from additional loss caused by one’s allocation. Explain which circumstances cannot be changed, which option was selected within them, and who bears its cost. Otherwise a general statement about difficult times conceals a specific managerial action.

In a hypothetical workshop, a delayed delivery makes the previous plan unworkable. Delivery can be postponed, scope reduced, or different work proposed with renewed agreement. The leader’s easiest option may be to preserve the external promise and silently ask workers to find missing hours. Convenience does not create those hours or cancel their existing obligations. Discuss the cost in terms of money, dates, displaced work, necessary checks, and people’s availability. Every personal detail need not be known; other people’s lives must not be treated as empty space in which to repair one’s plan.

An agreed cost may still prove excessive when substantial new information appears. Reconsidering conditions should not become grounds for punishing initial agreement. Each revision must also consider people already relying on it. Within their authority, the leader answers for timely notice, a possible substitute, and an intelligible next step. They cannot promise that nobody will be disappointed. They can avoid enlarging harm through uncertainty, concealment, or calling a choice voluntary when it is accepted under a disproportionate threatened consequence. Assessing that pressure requires concrete circumstances rather than a single label.

X. Conditions Must Last Through Handover and Closure

Leadership does not end with announcing success. An unfulfilled promise, untransferred material, or someone unaware of the new arrangement still gives the duty an object. A useful ending distinguishes completed work, remaining checks, and what will deliberately not be done. People can then end their participation without endless waiting. A large closing ritual is unnecessary; an intelligible message and an accepted handover may suffice. Unilaterally declaring everything closed, however, does not remove a substantial obligation whose recipient still reasonably relies on fulfilment.

When leadership changes, transfer the grounds of current conditions as well as access rights. The successor should know which limits were agreed and why an unusual arrangement remained. This does not bind them to every old choice forever. Within their rights, they can revise it openly, naming the change and its consequences. The previous leader should not

retain hidden control through an unclear handover or personal promises to the team. Define temporary authority until handover is accepted; afterward avoid creating two competing sources of binding decisions.

A final examination of power is simple in form but demands an honest answer: can participants understand their obligation, obtain necessary means, report a substantial obstacle, and end their role on intelligible conditions? A negative answer does not prove the leader is a bad person. It identifies where authority stopped serving the joint task. The agreement may be repaired, a decision reassigned, a demand reduced, or the role relinquished. Leadership need not make someone the source of every success. It requires answering for the conditions they actually establish without claiming authority never entrusted to them.

What this means in practice

Choose a hypothetical or actual work task you are entitled to discuss. Write down its purpose and result boundary: what should be done and what the agreement excludes. Name four conditions: available means, an independent decision for the worker, a question requiring approval, and a reason to stop. Do not mark an unknown condition as already satisfied. First obtain clarification from whoever can provide it.

Examine one contribution you made to uncertainty. Perhaps you changed scope, delayed an answer, or left two contradictory priorities. State a correction as action: the choice you make, the demand you withdraw, the information you will provide, and when. Do not require immediate trust or gratitude in return. The affected person needs an opportunity to check that the agreement actually changed.

Finally, identify routes for objection and closure. Who receives a substantial new circumstance, who answers during your absence, and what constitutes an accepted handover? Safety, rights, or private information may require more than ordinary team discussion: an appropriate independent or professional route can be needed. Do not arrange a dangerous trial to test leadership. The practice aims to make one real obligation clearer and more workable. It neither measures a leader’s personality nor guarantees trust, effectiveness, or freedom from conflict.

Key quotation

> *We are as we are, of ourselves!*

Tao Teh King, 17.2, James Legge’s translation. This ancient image does not remove a leader’s duty to explain decisions and answer for them.

Connections between traditions

Platonic debate — whose good authority serves; perfect expertise is not an infallible manager. Confucian perspective — confidence and the ruler's conduct; historical hierarchy does not become a modern work agreement. Taoist image — people acting without the ruler's constant self-assertion; discretion does not justify hidden control. Editorial connection — intelligible conditions, proportionate authority, and an open route to revision; a comparison of differences, not one ancient doctrine.

Primary sources

1. Plato, Republic, Book I, Benjamin Jowett, third edition. Continuous debate 341–347e read, displayed lines 2061–2207. Includes Thrasymachus' objections; not an empirical theory of management.

2. Confucius, Analects, James Legge. XII.I–XI and XIII.I–VI read in full, displayed lines 324–338, 352–361. English text omits the Chinese original and notes; historical hierarchy remains part of its setting.

3. Tao Teh King, James Legge. Chapters 16–18 read in full, displayed lines 119–127. Relation to the Tao does not replace present responsibility. Short Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations; worldwide rights for these particular editions are not established.

Tags

leadership, power, responsibility, working conditions, authority, management, trust, autonomy, delegation, work agreement, personal example, objection, approval, boundaries, care, control, decision, resources, deadlines, changed conditions, fairness, shared work, Plato, Confucius, Taoism, Tao Teh King, transparency, role handover, closure, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.